ENGLISH ARCHITECTS.

The fac-simile at the head of the column we have traced, by permission, from a receipt for monies paid at the exchequer to Henry Flitcroft, a pupil of Sir Christopher Wren, and one of those useful and industrious individuals of moderate talent, whom the great architect had the judgment to select as assistants in carrying forward the numerous works in which he was engaged; a class neither aiming or pretending to rival their instructor and patron, yet professionally capable of important undertakings. Flitcroft was fellow-clerk with Hawksmoor, and it is remarkable that, although both afterwards held official situations, and erected several churches in the metropolis, the sources of information usually referred to are silent respecting them; they were known only as performing certain public duties, and as builders of certain edifices; it is chiefly in the latter capacity that a recollection of them is interesting.

Henry Flitcroft was architect of the church of St. Olave's, Southwark, within these few days nearly destroyed by the fire at Topping's Wharf; that edifice is supposed to have been built from an unemployed design of Sir C. Wren, but in the absence of certainty as to the truth of such surmise, must be cited as a creditable example of the talent of the actual builder. St. Olave's was one of those plain, unostentatious piles, sufficiently appropriate and commodious for the devotional requirements of the numerous and highly respectable congregation frequenting it, but without further pretension to particular notice. The site has been occupied by successive churches, dating from six or seven centuries back; the first of which, in conformity to the immemorial custom of dedication, was named after St. Olave, or Olaff, whose martyrdom (which occurred probably before the Conquest) for religion's sake, by the hands of his Danish countrymen, had been commemorated in the Roman calendar, and this selection of a patron arose, no doubt, from some spot in or near the parish having been the scene of his suffering. St. Olave's was a very interesting locality in the olden time; extending to the drawbridge that, in the reigns of the Henrys and Edwards, barred the free passage of London Bridge, It was of course the only avenue of approach by land to the City and Westminster, and must, as such, have been the scene of many a hostile demonstration as well as stately pageant. The mitred clergy were partial to the Surrey side of the city defences; here the Abbot of Lewes had a house, upon or near the spot where now stands the King's Head Inn; and others of the same dignity were domiciled in St. Olave's, during their attendance on the Parliament or their diocesan of Canterbury. If our recollection serves us at the moment, the first bishops of Rochester also had a palace on the Surrey side, and one of the Edwards a noble house at his manor of Kennington.

Whatever doubt may exist as to originality on Flitcroft's part with respect to the design for St. Olave's, he has indisputable claim to the plan and building throughout of the church of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. This edifice is familiar to most of our readers, and is a fair example of Wren's school in second-rate churches; the architect began it the year following the completion of St. Olave's, viz. 1730, and finished it within five years, at a total cost of ten thousand pounds. Interiorly, St. Giles's presents an agreeable variety of the style which prevails in the new growth of churches consequent upon the great fire of London; in this instance the Ionic order is adopted, and the enriched ceiling, wrought in square panels, enclosing circles with centre ornaments, has considerable merit. We take the opportunity of offering to the notice of our readers a genuine piece of criticism which followed close upon the completion of St. Giles's, and appeared in the Critical Review of 1735. We find little to carp at in the general opinion of the writer, except the flippant manner in which innovation upon the position of churches towards the cardinal points, sanctioned by universal accord and practice, is advocated; whatever of ancient custom in matters of religious feeling can be preserved without exciting dissent is valuable, and this nearly solitary feature of unity we would not see disturbed. The *gentility* of a steeple is, so far as our limited experience extends, a quality hitherto undefined. "The new church of St. Giles's is one of the most simple and elegant of the modern structures; it is raised at very little expense, has few ornaments, and little beside the propriety of its parts and the harmony of the whole to excite attention and challenge applause; yet still it pleases, and justly too; the east end is both plain and majestic, and there is nothing in the west to object to but the smallness of the doors and the poverty of appearance that must necessarily follow; the steeple is light, airy, and genteel, and argues a good deal of genius in the architect, and looks very well in comparison with the body of the church, and when it is considered as a building by itself in a distant prospect. Yet after all I have confessed in favour of this edifice, I cannot help again arraigning the superstition of situating churches due east and west, for in compliance to this folly, the building before us has lost a great advantage it might otherwise have enjoyed; I mean making the east end the front, and placing it in such a manner as to have ended the vista called broad St. Giles's; whereas now it is nowhere to be seen with ease to the eye, or so as justly to comprehend the symmetry and connection of the whole."

With the exception of the five structures named there is reason to believe that the labours of Flitcroft were limited to execution of the ordinary duties of supervision. He was many years contemporary with N. Hawksmoor and William Kent, in the service of the Board of Works, as clerk of the works for St. James's, Whitehall, and Westminster, at a salary of £90 per ann.; Kent (the architectural decorator, landscape gardener, &c., so highly patronized by the Earl of Burlington), being *master mason* under the same board, at £200 per ann.; and Hawksmoor secretary at £100 per ann. Of the latter we gave a sketch in a former number. The works of William Kent, whose style prevailed to some extent, and of which examples are still fresh, will form the subject of a future notice.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—I beg to hand you the enclosed note, which, in justice to Mr. Perkins, may I request insertion for in your next number.

I remain, Sir, very respectfully,
GEORGE SPENCER.

5, Hungerford-street,
August 30, 1843.

Sir,—We seem to have misled you (as appears by the tenor of your paper in THE BUILDER), in stating that the apparatus for warming these premises was laid down by Mr. Perkins. Messrs. Burbidge and Healey, of Fleet-street, who, I believe, are licensed by Mr. Perkins for that purpose, are the gentlemen who constructed the apparatus.

I remain, yours, &c.,
J. P. MARSH.

8, New Burlington-street,
August 29, 1843.

[The foregoing came to hand just as we were closing for the press.—ED.]

WARMING AND VENTILATION.

This subject, if not becoming too *hot* for us, and threatening *a breeze* from which we must somewhat shroud ourselves or escape, bids fair to absorb too much of our tenement for experiment. THE BUILDER can afford, and it is its province to assign, a liberal portion of its countenance to that important section of the fraternity who take charge of the important subject in question, but our other brethren must not be *stoved* out, or *steamed and parboiled* altogether against their will. In addition to Dr. Ramadge's letter, which is important in a twofold sense, and goes to prove that which we have asserted as to the superior part which THE BUILDER has to take in the question of PUBLIC HEALTH, we have Mr. Bernhardt and T. H. C. again, and, for the first time, we have Mr. Perkins in the field of controversy. Mr. Perkins' letter is, however, highly entitled to admission, and it shall have it; but we must defer it for a week. Meanwhile it behoves us to hasten to correct, from its statement, another error which Mr. Spencer appears to have fallen into of the same class as in the case of Mr. Bernhardt, and which he should be somewhat more cautious to avoid. It will be recollected that in Mr. Spencer's first communication, he stated Mr. Bernhardt's system to have been in use at the Custom House, and arguing upon this assumption as a fact, drew, and probably led others to draw, most unjust or at any rate incorrect inferences in regard of Mr. Bernhardt's system, for it turned out on explanation that this gentleman had had nothing whatever to do with the Custom House apparatus, and that it was totally contrary to his plan or principles. So now it also appears that Mr. Perkins, so far from having had the "*personal direction*" of the fitting and application of the apparatus at Mr. Bentley's establishment, as alleged by Mr. Spencer, did not even know of its existence till he read Mr. Spencer's letter in THE BUILDER. It is true that Mr. Spencer did, in the case of Mr. Bernhardt, make the apology, as he will no doubt do in this on being corrected; but it is rather hard upon any man to have currency given to prejudicial reports affecting his professional existence even for a week, when proper care would have sufficed to avoid falling into the mistakes.

POMPEIAN AND HERCULEAN PAPER-HANGINGS.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—In No. 28, Peregrine informs us that he has had no reason to alter his opinion, and I am not at all surprised at this, for if he were, he would spoil it; and it is not yet a month old.

I stated certain facts which I know cannot be refuted, and as to our opinions, nobody cares about either, unless it be substantiated, though B. A. A. D. might be attached to each.

Let his observation about the "flack-line" pass with this notice: I shall do as I promised, unless some other person do it in the mean time; then, as the benefit would be the same, come from whom it may, that person may take the whole credit to himself, and as I am never disposed to quarrel with a man because he happen to be first in the doing of good, I shall be perfectly well satisfied.

Now, if a man take delight in the innocent and soul-invigurating pleasure of cultivating the flower-garden, does he not *twist up* the nasty, noxious, illshapen, and devil-created weeds (for mind, they were called into existence by the curse), and then he leaves them to perish, or destroys them with fire. When they are in blossom, they are most disgusting, for their smell is then most offensive, and even poisonous, and their bloom, as it is called, is a sort of burlesque, and their colours being what might very properly be termed the *neuter gender*. As food, even the beast of the field avoids them, and that most cautiously; and the work of extermination is continually going on against them, and one might almost believe that, as regards them, instinct is transferred to humanity, for they are uprooted by man, woman, and child.

Now, is all this done in *depreciation* of the pretty flowers? Oh no, it is that the violet, jessamine, the honeysuckle, and the others, may flourish in sweetness and beauty.

I am, Sir, your very humble servant,
JOHN BARR.

The Government has insisted upon the tunnels between Paris and Rouen being lighted, and given an order that all railroad companies shall light their tunnels.

Learn more about PDF Compression and OCR go to TheDigitizationOffice.com